

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/471,523	Applicant(s) BOLTON ET AL.	
	Examiner Tomas Friend	Art Unit 1627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tomas Friend.

(3) Alice Martin.

(2) Andrew Wang.

(4) Richard van Breemen (telephonic).

Date of Interview: 17 October 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed claims 13 and 14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Venton et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The inventor described differences between the present method and that disclosed by Venton et al. Possible amendments to the claim language that would reflect the differences were discussed, particularly with respect to the nature of the compounds being analyzed and their reactions and/or interactions with biological samples.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


PADMASHRI PONNALURI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

AGENDA FOR INTERVIEW - THURS. OCT. 17, 2002, 9AM EST
SERIAL NO. 09/471,523
INVENTOR: VAN BREEMEN ET AL.
OUR REF. NO. 21726/90386

Dr. Richard van Breemen 312-996-9353

Supervisor Joseph McKanye 703-308-1235

Examiner Thomas Friend 703-308-4548

Claim Status

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 were pending

Claims 13-24 were added but not entered.

ONLY PROBLEM = VENTON

Advisory Action was Issued August 22, 2002

1. The last amendment (August 2, 2002) was not entered because the Examiner believes new issues and new matter were raised. The only reason given is that new claims 13-24 potentially require further search. Examples were:

(a) "use as a **natural product**" which

(1) Doesn't require a new search because the term doesn't affect the method

(2) This term WAS IN OLD CLAIM 3 (as shown in a detailed comparison of old vs. new claims provided with the amendment and should have already been searched.

(b) "**continuous flow**" (supportive solution)

Further distances claims from Venton.

2. In the Interview of July 31, 2002 Dr. van Breemen explained:

Development vs. Discovery
(Van Breemen) (Venton)

Van Breemen = Development

FIRST SOLUTION

(BUFFER - Supportive Solution?)¹ - BIOL. MATERIALS E.G.

- ENZYME
- HIGH MOL. WT. ENZ.
- OTHER?

TEST SAMPLE
(SAME AS
COMPOUND?
CLAIM 11? LOW
MOL. WT.)

ULTRAFILTRATION CHAMBER
(MEMBRANE) FUNCTION?

SECOND SOLUTION

ANALYZE ULTRAFILTRATE (E.G. MASS
SPECTROMETRY)

Venton = Discovery

TEST SOLUTION

ULTRAFILTRATION
CHAMBER (MEMBRANE)

-BOUND
- RELEASE &
ANALYZE

UNBOUND ----> DISCARD

¹ Supportive = liquid phase that flows through ultrafiltration chamber.

AGENDA FOR INTERVIEW - THURS. OCT. 17, 2002, 9AM EST
SERIAL NO. 09/471,523
INVENTOR: VAN BREEMEN *ET AL.*
OUR REF. NO. 21726/90386

History of Patent Prosecution (21726/90386)

Filed 1999

Dr. Maurie Garcia - 2000

- restriction requirement response 11/30/2000

Dr. Venkat - Supervisor

Dr. Barba Karoma 1/12/2001

- Office Action on the merits 6/5/2001
- Response

Dr. Prasthofer (Friend)

- Second restriction requirement 8/29/2001
- no response required (according to supervisor)
- within 1-11 rejection 12/4/2001
- lengthy new Office Action 3/5/2002
- final rejection 6/3/02